Attorney Docket No.: ZEPH-00201

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-25 were previously pending in the instant application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-9, 20 24 and 25 have been rejected and Claims 10-19, 22 and 23 have been objected to. By way of the above amendments Claims 1, 10, 20 and 25 have been amended, Claim 21 has been canceled and new Claims 26 and 27 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 and 22-25 are now pending in this application.

## **Objection to the Claims:**

5

10

15

20

25

30

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-25 have been objected to for a number of informalities. Claims 1, 10, 20 and 25 have been amended to correct theses informalities.

Claim 10-19 have been indicated as allowable if amended to correct the aforementioned informalities. Accordingly, Claim 10-19 are now allowable. Claims 21-23 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include any of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 21 and Claim 21 has been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 20, 22 and 23 are now allowable.

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,375,579 to Hart (hereafter "Hart"). The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 24 and 25 as being anticipated by Hart is considered moot in view of the above amendments.

The independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite a device that indicates lateral alignment as a positioning object is moved through a trajectory in the communication path between the positioning object and the target object and towards the target object. Applicant contends that these features in combination with other features recited in the independent Claim 1 are neither taught or suggested by Hart. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Hart.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Hart. Accordingly, Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are also all allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 21, which has been indicated also allowable if rewritten in independent form to include any of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the independent Claim 20 is now in allowable.

Claim 24 is dependent on the independent Claim 20. As described above, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Hart. Accordingly, Claim 24 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 25 has been amended to recite that an indicator provides an indication when the object is laterally moved in or out of a trajectory along the two-way communication path. Applicant contends that these features in combination with other features recited in the independent Claim 25 are neither taught or suggested by Hart. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Hart.

The New Claim 26 is essentially Claim 22 rewritten in independent form to include any of the limitations of the base Claim 20 and any intervening claims and the New Claim 27 is essentially Claim 23 rewritten in independent form to include any of the limitations of the base Claim 20 and any intervening claims, both of which have ben indicated as allowable.

15

5

10

For all of the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 and 22-27 are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

25

20

Dated: 1/29/2007

By:

James A. Gavney Jr.

30

Agent for Applicant(s)